

From: [Granger, Michelle](#)
To: [Hauber, Erin M CIV USARMY CENWK \(USA\)](#)
Subject: RE: Pohatcong OU3 30% RD comment updates
Date: Tuesday, November 20, 2018 3:06:00 PM

Hi, Erin-

Thank you for adjusting language in comments #6-10.

Kim feels pretty strongly about the soil confirmation sampling. The ROD says "after the completion of in-situ thermal treatment, soil samples would be collected from the treatment zone to evaluate the treatment effectiveness." Would you be able to send me a few bullets explaining the difficulties related to this? And, a few bullets explaining why using temperature, energy, input, and mass recovery, etc. (based on item #6 of your revised comments) should get us to the same endpoint?

Thank you!
Have a Wonderful Thanksgiving Holiday!
Best,
Michelle-

-----Original Message-----

From: Hauber, Erin M CIV USARMY CENWK (USA) <Erin.M.Hauber@usace.army.mil>
Sent: Thursday, November 15, 2018 12:36 PM
To: Granger, Michelle <Granger.Michelle@epa.gov>
Cc: Nanci Higginbotham <Nanci.E.Higginbotham@usace.army.mil>
Subject: Pohatcong OU3 30% RD comment updates

Michelle,

I adjusted the language in comments #6-10 to reflect 1) additional vapor monitoring to track mass recovery 2) more defined metric for diminishing returns in the 90% RD 3) a more conservative temperature metric.

I also talked to Patrick Nejand (USACE Construction) on Tuesday. He said Ramboll Environ (RE) is planning for 24-hour shifts, so no need to confirm with Bruce. I also talked to Wendy and Patrick about our split sampling approach. After some reflection, they would like to try to submit split samples where PID readings are the highest and hold our samples on ice (and maintain custody) until the first week in January once we're past the height of the holidays and shipping demands subside a little.

Please let me know if you'd like to discuss any of the above.

Erin

Erin Hauber, P.E.
Civil Engineer
Kansas City District
US Army Corps of Engineers
816.389.2280